

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: March 21, 2002
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
March 20, 2002 (Meeting #26)

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Elizabeth Cervený	City of La Center Mayor
Dean Dossett	City of Camas Mayor
Jeff Guard	City of Washougal Council Member
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member
Mary Kufeldt-Antle	City of Camas Council Member
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Debbie Smith	Town of Yacolt Council Member
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners

Public:

Marnie Allen	Consortium of Clark County Schools
Eric Boch	Clark Public Facilities
Foster Church	The Oregonian
Richard Cry	Clark Public Facilities
Kathy Folkers	Howsley Law Office
Ken Hadley	Self
Jessica Hoffman	Clark County Association of Realtors
Patrick Holmes	Lane Powell Spears Lubersky
Steve Horenstein	Miller Nash
James Howsley	Howsley Law Office
Dean Lookingbill	RTC
Erin Middlewood	The Columbian
Ole Rasmussen	Self
Don Wastle	Self

Staff:

Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Kate Bowie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Derek Chisholm	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Eisemann	Cities of La Center & Ridgefield
Bob Higbie	Clark County Asst. Long Range Planning Manager
Eric Holmes	City of Battle Ground Planning Director
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Oliver Orjiako	Clark County Long Range Planning
Rod Orlando	City of Yacolt - EES Consulting
Carol Parker	City of Battle Ground Interim Planning Director
Lou Peterson	City of Washougal City Council
Lowry Samuel	City of Vancouver Long Range Planning
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planner
Bryan Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner

1. Introductions

Stanton called the meeting to order at 4:07 PM at the Fire District #5 Training Center. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliation.

2. Review January 16, 2002 Meeting Notes

There were no corrections to the January 16, 2002 Meeting Summary and they were accepted as is.

3. Review of cities population/jobs ratio.

Lee presented that at the last meeting the cities came to a consensus of population allocations that will include UGA expansions identified for EIS and for the comprehensive plan. The county has asked the city staff to get the county information as soon as possible because the county has to determine potential land use applications of the city's recommendations.

City of Battle Ground - Holmes introduced Carol Parker, the interim planning director for Battle Ground. Parker announced that their first hearing on the comprehensive plan update was supposed to be this evening, but now it needs to be moved back a little because of lack of quorum. Holmes mentioned that the population and map allocations analysis that he passed out in a memo are a little different than what they talked with the other cities. The planning commission suggested a slightly more aggressive approach with employment. However, the map is still accurate that they gave the county.

City of Vancouver - Snodgrass presented that the city's general position is small residential expansion and larger industrial/jobs expansion. The population expansion they are requesting is 1200 additional people. The map passed out is accurate, except that the area to the north may still be in discussion. Morris asked about the area in between Vancouver and Camas and Lee reported that they were going back to governing bodies to work it out. Nothing has been resolved yet.

City of Camas- Snell presented that they have not held hearings on the comprehensive plan yet. There is a map that staff has produced that will accommodate 2200 additional people. They also have employment figures for commercial and industrial. There was a spreadsheet that gave a best case scenario that did not include "never to convert" factors. They are now working on their Section 215 analysis. They are hoping to piggyback on the county's efforts with that.

City of Washougal- Anderson introduced Lou Peterson, from the City of Washougal City Council. They are not planning on making any boundary line changes. They are looking forward to changing some of their zoning to accommodate their need for industrial lands. They are also doing a stake holder interview process. On April 2nd, they are having a joint meeting with their planning commission and city council to confirm their position on the GMA.

City of Yacolt- Orlando introduced Debbie Smith, from the City of Yacolt City Council. Yacolt does not expect an expansion because they do not have a sewer system to accommodate the growth. Staff has been in the field inventorying the vacant land in the field and considering how that land may develop in the future. The growth can probably be accommodated in the UGA limit, but the town's numbers are different than the County's numbers. Yacolt is suspecting that any population increase they will see will not be linked to employment. Town council has a work session on the 10th to consider a sewer system and the comprehensive plan. That will be the first time that everyone will be together to discuss this.

City of La Center- Eisemann said that the planning commission has been looking at a UGA expansion of 40 net acres. The map in the packet, however, shows more than 40 net acres. A hearing will be in late spring. They will look at a residential expansion. They have a downtown revitalization going on now. They have had work sessions on manufactured housing and multi-family housing issues. They are just starting to look at unallocated population and if their current land could accommodate the unallocated growth.

City of Ridgefield - Eisemann presented that there is no UGA expansion asked for. They want to increase their densities to accommodate the allocated growth. There is a proposal

before the city to expand for an employment center. The area they want to expand into is now zoned for agriculture purposes.

Schools:

Lee said that about a year ago the group discussed the subject of siting schools outside of UGA's. The county has encouraged the school district to work with jurisdictions so that every effort is made to find an appropriate place inside the UGA.

Allen said that policies now say that you have to look within the boundary first. If there is not an appropriate site, you can look outside the UGA within a 1/4 mile of the UGA. For the City of Ridgefield they are now looking at sites within the UGA.

Question from the public: Did the state recently extend the deadline for finishing GMA comprehensive plan requirements? Stanton explained that there was a bill passed to extend the deadline for two more years that requires critical area ordinances to meet the new best available science standard. No extension for the comprehensive plan has been given.

Question from public: Does the county contact the property owners about being included UGA? Lee talked about annual reviews and site specific requests (SSR's) and that they are two ways for property owners in the county to request a zone designation change or to be included in the UGA. Most people that apply for annual reviews are public agencies. Site specific requests are now close to 200 requests and just require a letter sent to the county. The board has indicated that the SSR's are the first ones to be considered when thinking about UGA expansion. There are also a series of public meetings that have countywide mailings that try to notify people about the process. The member of the public asked if we directly notify people. Stanton mentioned that we have a very public process. She also mentioned that according to surveys, the public prefers to be notified by direct mailings.

Question from the public: He asked about the policy that was adopted that says that urban reserve should come into the UGA first and wondered why his property is not coming into the UGA. Lee mentioned that the comprehensive plan says that we would look at the reserves first, but they don't all come in first. The board did direct the staff to not lock in on the reserve, but to look at what is best for the county. Member of the public: He wanted to know why the reserves don't have to be brought in first since the board adopted it as policy. He thought it would be breaking the law for the county to not follow that policy. Lee mentioned that we bring in the sites that make the most sense. Morris explained that it is a policy made by the county commissioners that can be changed by the county commissioners, but it is not a law.

4. Comprehensive Plan Review

Lee mentioned the time frame in the packet that the county is using. The county is now developing alternatives and by August the county hopes to provide a preferred alternative. The county will then move into the planning commission and county commission process. For purposes of SEPA, the county will show several generic maps to show the range of alternatives for growth in the county. One will show the 1994 policies, the second will hold all of the UGAs constant, and the third will be the city's alternatives. There is a lot of process going into these alternatives that will include a public process, the first of which are a series of meetings in April that the entire county is getting a mailing about encouraging them to attend. These early meetings are also scoping requirements for the EIS.

Camas mentioned they have two public meetings in April and May. Lee said that should work fine with the county's schedule.

5. Next Meeting date and time-

Wednesday, April 17th - The meeting will probably be held at the same location.

6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee- march 20,2002.doc